



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Group Art Unit 3676

In re Patent Application of:

Veniamin A. Foigel et al.

Application No.: 10/614,457

Confirmation No. 2276

Filed: July 9, 2003

Examiner: Carlos Lugo

Title: "CABLE LOCK AND METHOD"

I, Elizabeth L. Eiche, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date of my signature.

Elizabeth Eiche
Signature

5-15-2006

Date of Signature

EXAMINER'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY AND
COMMENTS ON STATEMENTS OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following comments are further to the February 1, 2006 Interview between the Examiner and the undersigned Applicant's Representative, and are also submitted in response to the February 15, 2006 Notice of Allowance issued in the above-referenced patent application.

In the February 1, 2006 Examiner's Interview, claim 7 of the present application was discussed. The Applicant agreed to a proposed amendment to claim 7 as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment dated February 2, 2006. No particular prior art was discussed in the Examiner's Interview.

In the Reasons for Allowance, the Examiner provides reasons for the allowance of claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, and 15-18. The Applicant respectfully submits that the reasons for allowance do not accurately characterize a number of the allowed claims, and do not set forth all of the reasons why the claims of the present application are allowable.

In the reasons for allowance, the Examiner paraphrases independent claims 1, 5, 7, 9, and 11 of the present application. However, this paraphrased description of claims 1, 5, 7, 9, and 11 fails to completely describe and/or mischaracterizes some of the claimed elements and features. For example, claim 11 does not call for the limitation of “the wall positioned to block access into the cavity of the housing”, as suggested by the Examiner. As another example, claim 7 does not call for “an aperture [having] a twisted or spiral shape” as also suggested by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, and 15-18 are allowable based upon the combination of elements and features claimed in claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, and 15-18, rather than upon a characterization of claims 1, 5, 7, 9, and 11 as set forth in the reasons for allowance.

Furthermore, each of claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, and 15-18 include other elements, features, and combinations of elements and features that patentably distinguish the claims from the prior art. The Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, and 15-18 are separately patentable based upon the combinations of features and elements (and relationships thereof) claimed in claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, and 15-18 rather than upon any one feature, element, sub-combination of features and/or elements, or operational description as indicated in the reasons for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher B. Austin
Reg. No. 41,592

Docket No. 011403-9001-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414-271-6560